

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application, and in the Office Action, the Examiner issued a final rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,605,102 (Hearn, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,081,263 (LeGall, et al.). Claim 16 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

The rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is respectfully traversed. Also, Applicants herein ask that Claim 16 be amended to address the rejection of the claim under 35 U.S.C. 112.

With respect to Claim 16, the Examiner rejected the claim under 35 U.S.C. 112 because the claim includes the phrase "page manager form," which is not contained per se in the specification. In response, Applicants herein ask that Claim 16 be amended to delete both occurrences of "page manager." As amended, Claim 16 describes "the form," and Claim 1, from which Claim 16 depends, provides a clear antecedent basis for this term. More specifically, the third subparagraph of Claim 1 positively sets forth "a form" for, among other things, reading a configuration document. This provides a clear, express antecedent basis for the term "the form" or "said form" later in the claims, including Claim 16.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is requested to enter this Amendment and to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

With regard to the rejection of the claims over the prior art, this rejection is respectfully traversed because the prior art does not disclose or suggest the procedure described in independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 for naming the web page.

In order to best understand this, it may be helpful to review briefly the present invention and the prior art.

The present invention, generally, relates to methods and systems for changing Web site pages. Current procedures for doing this often require the use of an application programmer and may require changes to the core application design.

In accordance with the present invention, a database is provided with a view having data therein, a configuration document describing characteristics of the Web page, and a form for managing changes to the pages. This form, more specifically, is used for reading the configuration document, for retrieving data from the above-mentioned view, and for placing the retrieved data on the page as described in the configuration file. A page address is formed from the names of the database, and the above-discussed change manager form, and this page address is selected to display the data on the page.

Hearn, et al. discloses a procedure for viewing different types of data in a single document. It appears that this reference is directed, at least in part, to a word processing type of application, having the ability to merge into documents various types of data, including text, graphics, spreadsheet cells, and database records.

With the procedure described in Hearn, et al. each data type is maintained within a dataset, which comprises logical information of a common data type along with the functions or processing logic needed to view and manipulate that data type. Datasets are managed by frames, which are used to view and to manipulate the datasets. By means of these frames, any type and number of datasets can be combined together into a single document and saved in a file system.

As the Examiner has recognized, Hearn, et al. fails to disclose or suggest a number of important features of the present invention. Because of this, the Examiner has had to rely on LeGall, et al. in order to reject the claims.

LeGall, et al. describes a computer user interface that enables the user to define multimedia and internet environments on a desktop. In the disclosed procedure, tools are used to drag items, such as a Web site, onto a scratch pad. User interactive components may also be displayed to the user.

Applicants respectfully submit that LeGall, et al. does not disclose all that it has been cited for. For instance, it is noted that column 5, lines 29-33 of LeGall, et al. does not actually teach forming a page address. In fact, LeGall, et al. does not disclose forming page addresses in the manner in which they are formed in the present invention.

It is important to emphasize that, with the present invention, the page name is not formed using the name of simply any form, but instead is formed from the name of a particular form -- the same for that is used for reading the configuration document, retrieving data from the database view, and placing the retrieved data on the page as described in the configuration file. This, neither Hearn, et al. nor LeGall, et al. discloses or suggests.

Independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 describe this feature of the invention. In particular, each of Claims 1, 6 and 11 describes the feature that the page address is formed from the name of the same form that is used to read the configuration characteristics, to retrieve the data, and to place that data on the web page in accordance with those configuration characteristics.

The other references of record have been reviewed; and, whether they are considered individually or in combination, these other references also fail to disclose or teach this feature of the invention.

It is noted that in the Office Action, the Examiner argued that this feature of the invention is not recited in the rejected claims. Applicants respectfully disagree. This is because each of Claims 1, 6 and 11 describes only one form, and thus, of necessity, the form the name of which is used to make the page address is the same form that is used for reading the configuration document, retrieving data from the above-mentioned view, and placing the retrieved data on the page as described in the configuration file.


More specifically, for example, Claim 1, fifth subparagraph refers to "said form"; however, the only form previously described in the claim is the form described in the third subparagraph. Thus, the form (as described in the fifth subparagraph) the name of which is used to form the page address is the same form (as described in the third subparagraph) that is used for reading the configuration document, retrieving data from the above-mentioned view, and placing the retrieved data on the page as described in the configuration file.

Accordingly, this feature is described in the claims and needs to be considered when determining the patentability of the claims.

In light of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 6 and 11 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, it cannot be said that any of these claims is obvious in view of that prior art. Thus, Claims 1, 6 and 11 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-5 and 16-18 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1. Likewise, Claims 7-10 are dependent from Claim 6 and are allowable therewith, and Claims 12-15 are dependent from Claim 11 and are allowable therewith. The Examiner is, accordingly, respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 and to allow these claims.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112 and the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow Claims 1-18. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,


John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy